



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Hv

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,780	07/12/2001	John Border	PD-201020	1489

7590 06/17/2005

Hughes Electronics Corporation
Patent Docket Administration
P.O. Box 956
Bldg. 1, Mail Stop A109
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

EXAMINER

ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/903,780	BORDER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kaveh Abrishamkar	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16, 18, 20 and 22-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16, 18, 20 and 22-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on March 23, 2005. Claims 1-35 were originally received for consideration. Per the received amendment, claims 17,19, and 21 are canceled and claims 1,15,16,18,20,22,26 and 29 are currently amended. Claims 1-16, 18, 20, and 22-35 are currently being considered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16,18,20, and 22-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The applicant argues that the CPA (Gelman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,415,329) does not disclose the added limitation wherein a second platform serves as a redundant platform when the first platform fails. The newly cited reference (Albert et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,742,045) is believed to teach the redundant platform in currently amended claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-16,18,20, and 22-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,329) in view of Albert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,742,045).

Regarding claim 1, Gelman discloses:

A method for performing redundancy switching from a first platform to a second platform, the method comprising:

identifying a message received over a connection according to a prescribed protocol as an unspoofed message (column 4 lines 10 –45, column 9 line 66 – column 10 line 8);

terminating, during a predetermined period, the connection based upon the identifying step (Figure 10, column 10 lines 1 – 8, column 15 line 47 – column 17 line 20).

Gelman does not explicitly disclose restarting a spoofed connection between the second platform and a host wherein the second platform serves as a redundant platform for the first platform. Albert teaches a system in which service managers have backup service managers for the purpose of providing a fail over scheme if a master service manager should fail (column 10 lines 41-51). The service managers may be implemented on a router, and provide a service for packets before forwarding the packets into the network (column 10 lines 24-30). Gelman also discloses apparatuses similar to service managers as the Performance Enhancing Proxies (PEPs) provide a

service of changing the TCP packets in order to spoof a connection over a satellite link. Gelman does not explicitly disclose a scheme in the instance that the PEP should fail. Albert provides a failover scheme involving backup service managers that would continue to provide a specified service to the packets in the event that the main service manager should fail. This would provide relatively uninterrupted service to the endpoints, besides the startup time for the backup PEP to sync up, which would provide packets that could tolerate long delay links (e.g. satellite links). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a redundant platform setup as in Albert to provide a backup PEP in the system of Gelman so that a backup can function as the primary did in the event that the primary should fail as to provide PEP service even if the primary PEP fails.

Regarding claim 8, Gelman discloses:

A communication system comprising:
a first platform configured to communicate with a remote platform (Figure 2, column 15 line 47 – column 17 line 20); and
a second platform configured to communicate with the remote platform, the second platform being configured to identify a message received from a local host over a connection according to a prescribed protocol as an unspoofed message, wherein the second platform terminates, during a predetermined period, the connection in response to the identified message (Figure 2, Figure 10, column 4 lines 10 – 45, column 9 line 66 – column 10 line 8, column 15 line 47 – column 17 line 20).

Art Unit: 2131

Gelman does not explicitly disclose restarting a connection between the second platform and a host wherein the second platform serves as a redundant platform for the first platform. Albert teaches a system in which service managers have backup service managers for the purpose of providing a fail over scheme if a master service manager should fail (column 10 lines 41-51). The service managers may be implemented on a router, and provide a service for packets before forwarding the packets into the network (column 10 lines 24-30). Gelman also discloses apparatuses similar to service managers as the Performance Enhancing Proxies (PEPs) provide a service of changing the TCP packets in order to spoof a connection over a satellite link. Gelman does not explicitly disclose a scheme in the instance that the PEP should fail. Albert provides a failover scheme involving backup service managers that would continue to provide a specified service to the packets in the event that the main service manager should fail. This would provide relatively uninterrupted service to the endpoints, besides the startup time for the backup PEP to sync up, which would provide packets that could tolerate long delay links (e.g. satellite links). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a redundant platform setup as in Albert to provide a backup PEP in the system of Gelman so that a backup can function as the primary did in the event that the primary should fail as to provide PEP service even if the primary PEP fails.

Regarding claim 15, Gelman discloses:

A communication gateway for providing redundant communication in a communication system having a remote platform, the gateway comprising:

a communication interface configured to communicate with a primary gateway configured to support a spoofed connection over a backbone connection to the remote platform (Figure 10, column 10 lines 1 – 8, column 15 line 47 – column 17 line 20); and

a processor coupled to the communication interface and configured to restart a spoofed connection (Figure 2, Figure 10, column 4 lines 10 – 45, column 9 line 66 – column 10 line 8, column 15 line 47 – column 17 line 20).

Gelman does not explicitly disclose restarting a connection between the second platform and a host upon detection of a redundancy switch, wherein the second platform serves as a redundant platform for the first platform. Albert teaches a system in which service managers have backup service managers for the purpose of providing a fail over scheme if a master service manager should fail (column 10 lines 41-51). The service managers may be implemented on a router, and provide a service for packets before forwarding the packets into the network (column 10 lines 24-30). Gelman also discloses apparatuses similar to service managers as the Performance Enhancing Proxies (PEPs) provide a service of changing the TCP packets in order to spoof a connection over a satellite link. Gelman does not explicitly disclose a scheme in the instance that the PEP should fail. Albert provides a failover scheme involving backup service managers that would continue to provide a specified service to the packets in the event that the main service manager should fail. This would provide relatively uninterrupted service to the endpoints, besides the startup time for the backup PEP to

sync up, which would provide packets that could tolerate long delay links (e.g. satellite links). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a redundant platform setup as in Albert to provide a backup PEP in the system of Gelman so that a backup can function as the primary did in the event that the primary should fail as to provide PEP service even if the primary PEP fails.

Regarding claim 22, Gelman discloses:

A communication gateway for providing redundant communication in a communication system having a remote platform, the gateway comprising:
means for identifying a message received over a connection according to a prescribed protocol as an unspoofed message (column 4 lines 10 –45, column 9 line 66 – column 10 line 8);

means for terminating, during a predetermined period, the connection based upon the identified message (Figure 10, column 10 lines 1 – 8, column 15 line 47 – column 17 line 20); and

means for restarting a spoofed connection (Figure 10, column 10 lines 1 – 8, column 15 line 47 – column 17 line 20).

Gelman does not explicitly disclose restarting a connection between the second platform and a host upon detection of a redundancy switch, wherein the second platform serves as a redundant platform for the first platform. Albert teaches a system in which service managers have backup service managers for the purpose of providing

a fail over scheme if a master service manager should fail (column 10 lines 41-51). The service managers may be implemented on a router, and provide a service for packets before forwarding the packets into the network (column 10 lines 24-30). Gelman also discloses apparatuses similar to service managers as the Performance Enhancing Proxies (PEPs) provide a service of changing the TCP packets in order to spoof a connection over a satellite link. Gelman does not explicitly disclose a scheme in the instance that the PEP should fail. Albert provides a failover scheme involving backup service managers that would continue to provide a specified service to the packets in the event that the main service manager should fail. This would provide relatively uninterrupted service to the endpoints, besides the startup time for the backup PEP to sync up, which would provide packets that could tolerate long delay links (e.g. satellite links). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a redundant platform setup as in Albert to provide a backup PEP in the system of Gelman so that a backup can function as the primary did in the event that the primary should fail as to provide PEP service even if the primary PEP fails.

Regarding claim 29, Gelman discloses:

A computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of one or more instructions for performing redundancy switching from a first platform to a second platform, the one or more sequences of one or more instructions including instructions

which, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to perform the steps of:

identifying a message received over a connection according to a prescribed protocol as an unspoofed message (column 4 lines 10 –45, column 9 line 66 – column 10 line 8); and

terminating, during a predetermined period, the connection based upon the identifying step (Figure 10, column 10 lines 1 – 8, column 15 line 47 – column 17 line 20).

Gelman does not explicitly disclose restarting a spoofed connection between the second platform and a host wherein the second platform serves as a redundant platform for the first platform. Albert teaches a system in which service managers have backup service managers for the purpose of providing a fail over scheme if a master service manager should fail (column 10 lines 41-51). The service managers may be implemented on a router, and provide a service for packets before forwarding the packets into the network (column 10 lines 24-30). Gelman also discloses apparatuses similar to service managers as the Performance Enhancing Proxies (PEPs) provide a service of changing the TCP packets in order to spoof a connection over a satellite link. Gelman does not explicitly disclose a scheme in the instance that the PEP should fail. Albert provides a failover scheme involving backup service managers that would continue to provide a specified service to the packets in the event that the main service manager should fail. This would provide relatively uninterrupted service to the endpoints, besides the startup time for the backup PEP to sync up, which would provide

packets that could tolerate long delay links (e.g. satellite links). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a redundant platform setup as in Albert to provide a backup PEP in the system of Gelman so that a backup can function as the primary did in the event that the primary should fail as to provide PEP service even if the primary PEP fails.

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gelman discloses:

The method according to claim 1, further comprising:
invoking a reset function, wherein the reset function transmits a reset message to a local host that forwarded the message to terminate the connection (column 10 lines 1 – 9, column 22 lines 25 – 40, column 23 lines 25 – 34).

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gelman discloses:

The method according to claim 1, further comprising: determining whether the predetermined period has expired (column 5 lines 10 – 22, column 10 lines 1 – 38); and forwarding unspoofed messages to a remote platform based upon the determining step (column 10 lines 1 – 38).

Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gelman discloses:

The method according to claim 1, wherein the prescribed protocol is the Transmission Control Protocol, the method further comprising:
determining whether global TCP spoofing is enabled (column 9 line 16 – column 10 line 37); and
selectively forward TCP segments unspoofed to a remote platform (column 9 line 16 – column 10 line 37).

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gelman discloses:

The method according to claim 1, further comprising:
establishing a backbone connection from the second platform to a remote platform (Figure 10, column 15 line 47 – column 17 line 20); and
forwarding a spoofed message over the backbone connection to a remote host (Figure 10, column 15 line 47 – column 17 line 20).

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gelman discloses:

The method according to claim 1, further comprising: forwarding messages associated with another protocol to a remote platform irrespective of the predetermined period (column 9 line 65 – column 10 line 38).

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gelman discloses:

The method according to claim 5, wherein the backbone connection in the establishing step includes a space link over a satellite network (Figures 1,2,14, column 1 line 21 – column 2 line 32).

4. Claims 9-14 are system claims analogous to the method claims rejected above, and therefore, are rejected following the same reasoning.
5. Claims 16 and 18, and 20are apparatus claims analogous to the method claims rejected above, and therefore, are rejected following the same reasoning.
6. Claims 23 – 28 are apparatus claims analogous to the method claims rejected above, and therefore, are rejected following the same reasoning.
7. Claims 30 – 35 are computer-readable medium claims analogous to the method claims rejected above, and therefore, are rejected following the same reasoning.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 571-272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KA
06/12/05


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100